

IV. REMARKS

Claims 1-40 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, the title and claims 1, 19 and 37 have been amended. These amendments are being made to facilitate early allowance of the presently claimed subject matter. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the title is objected to as allegedly being not descriptive. By this Amendment, the title has been revised to resolve this condition. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

In the Office Action, claims 2, 4-13 and 17-18 are objected to as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of claim 1. Applicants respectfully traverse this objection because each of claims 2, 4-13 and 17-18 further limits the claimed subject matter by, *inter alia*, specifying the situation(s) where one or more of steps c), 1), c), 2), and c), 3) will be conducted. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

In the Office Action, claims 37-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. By this amendment, Applicants have amended claim 37 to resolve this condition. Applicants submit that the claimed subject matter includes a tangible medium and the stored program code interacts with the tangible computer infrastructure to perform the patent protectable methods. As such, the subject matter of claim 37 is protectable under patent laws. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

In the Office Action, claims 1-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated

by Craft et al. (US 7,124,205), hereinafter “Craft”. Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed subject matter is allowable for the reasons that follow.

With respect to independent claims 1, 19 and 37, Applicants submit that Craft does not disclose, *inter alia*, “calculating a cyclical redundancy check (CRC) for the data transfer, wherein the CRC is one of valid and invalid[.]” (Claim 1, similarly claimed in claims 19 and 37). Craft discloses sequencers 52 validates a packet and creates a summary of those headers (col. 8, lines 10-11; col. 10, lines 46-47) and then processor 44 determines whether the packet is a candidate for fast-path processing or not based on the summary. However, Craft does not disclose calculating a cyclical redundancy check (CRC) for the data transfer. Craft does not disclose handling the data transfer based on validity of a CRC of a DDP segment. In Craft, whether a packet is for fast-path processing is determined instead based on “whether the header status summary matches a CCB held by the INIC.” (Col. 17, lines 20-21). The peripheral mentioning of validating packet in Craft does not enable a person with ordinary skill in the art to implement the currently claimed subject matter because Craft does not include the claimed details including the CRC calculation. In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that Craft does not anticipate the claimed invention, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

In addition, Craft also does not disclose handling a data transfer “based on a comparison between a transfer control protocol (TCP) segment length and a marker with protocol data unit alignment (MPA) length[.]” (Claims 1, 19 and 37). Craft discloses validating that the header length received has the correct length, which is not sufficient to enable an implementation of the current invention. Note that in the claimed invention, the comparison result is used in combination with the validity of a CRC of a DDP segment in choosing among the three listed possibilities: c),1), c),2), and c),3).

The dependent claims are believed allowable for the same reasons, as well as for their own additional features.

Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is necessary to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Spencer K. Warnick/

Spencer K. Warnick
Reg. No.: 40,398

Date: October 23, 2007

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)